

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,781	10/10/2001	Michael G. Kahn	FSTK 1004-1	8124
22470	7590 11/03/2006		EXAMINER	
HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP			COBANOGLU, DILEK B	
P O BOX 366 HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,	•	3626	
			DATE MAILED: 11/03/2000	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/974,781	KAHN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Dilek B. Cobanoglu	3626	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover she	et with the correspondence a	ddress
THE REPLY FILED 19 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CON	DITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. time periods:	endment, affidavit, or other evid peal fee) in compliance with 37	ence, which CFR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection	n.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS f Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	rom the mailing date of the final reje (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS	ction. S FILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under the been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the correspounder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory perious set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nding amount of the fee. The approduced for reply originally set in the final C	opriate extension fee Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 4′ filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period	41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of	
AMENDMENTS		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or sea		because
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by appeal; and/or 	materially reducing or simplifying	ng the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding numbe NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	r of finally rejected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Noti	ce of Non-Compliant Amendme	nt (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(/ / //
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in non-allowable claim(s). 	n a separate, timely filed amend	ment canceling the
 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or append The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none. Claim(s) objected to: none. Claim(s) rejected: 1-51. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none. 		n explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons w was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	e of filing a Notice of Appeal will hy the affidavit or other evidenc	not be entered e is necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier.	s under appeal and/or appellant	fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the © REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	claims after entry is below or att	ached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the See continuation sheet.	application in condition for allow	vance because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper N	o(s)	
13. Other:	_	
	0//	
La Company of the Com	11/13-	
Primar DATI	ÜKE GILLIGAN ENT EXAMINER	
THE PAIN	EN EXAMINER	

Continuation of 11: Applicant disagrees that claims 1, 10 and 42 are rejected under U.S.C. section 112 for being indefinite. Applicant continues that "said protocol specification specifies such a parameter too vaguely to be encoded into said database or said protocol specification specifies such a parameter inconsistently" is clear because the databse in the claim is not any regular database, it refers to a "said database". As stated in the previous final action, there are no specific and clear limits of the real values or parameters on these claims. There is no particular value indicate a parameter, which is "too vaguely". Also, since the parameter would be unknown in the claim, "protocol specification specifying such a parameter would be unclear, as explained in the previous final office action. Applicant disagrees with the 112 rejection of claims 1 and 42, because there is no sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation of "an indication that an operational uncertainty exists". "Identifying an operational uncertainty in which said protocol specification specifies such a parameter too vaguely" is not clear as explained in the previos office action and above, therefore "an indication that said operational uncertainty exists" does not have a sufficient antecedent basis for this limitaiton. The value of the parameter or the parameter being to vague is not clear in the claim, therefore "said protocol specification specifying such a parameter inconsistently" is not clear and indefinite as explained in the previous office action and above.

Applicant argues that Herren reference does not teach operational uncertainty, protocol specification fails to specify a particular parameter for use during protocol execution. At the March 2, 2006 interview, Examiners suggested that the method claim 1 and the rest of the claims would be amended to clarify the meaning of "operational uncertainty". With the broadest interpretation, Examiner respectfully submits that the combination of references Brown (6,196,970), Friedman (6,055,494) and Herren (6,108,635) teach these limitations as explained in the previous office action. (Brown; col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 4, col. 6, lines 19, 23, 43-45), (Herren; col. 5, line 45 to col. 6, line 7).